

A

0
0
1
0
0
5
3
2
1

3



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

GUNKEL

Israel And Babylon

BS

1180

D5

G8

nia



ISRAEL AND BABYLON

THE INFLUENCE OF BABYLON ON
THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

[A REPLY TO DELITZSCH]

BY
HERMAN GUNKEL, D. D.
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN
Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

BY
E. S. B.

PHILADELPHIA
JOHN JOS. McVEY
1904

ISRAEL AND BABYLON

THE INFLUENCE OF BABYLON ON
THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

[A REPLY TO DELITZSCH]

BY

HERMAN GUNKEL, D. D.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF BERLIN

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

BY

E. S. B.

PHILADELPHIA
JOHN JOS. McVEY
1904

MIT

COPYRIGHT,
1904
JOHN J. McVEY.

PREFACE

For presenting to the English-speaking public this translation an explanation is scarcely necessary. Since the days of Ferdinand Christian Baur no theological controversy has so agitated Germany as has this present question as to the relation between the Old Testament and the traditions of Babylon. Opened on January 13th, 1902, by the now famous lecture before the Emperor, the struggle has raged and is raging yet with a fury of almost unparalled violence. The literature on the subject has become so voluminous as to form almost a library in itself. Prof. Delitzsch cites some twenty titles in the appendix to the second edition of his first lecture but these are but a modicum of the whole.

In one regard especially the present situation may be paralleled with the Baur controversy. Nearly every person who could contrive to print or to have printed his views on the subject has done so and, in consequence, by far the greater part of the pamphlets and articles that have appeared display a lack of proper information—not to say, *learning*. That a reply should be in some measure as well informed as the attack is a principle that has been disregarded in too many instances, and such a disregard merely assists in weakening the cause defended.

None the less, many scientists and theologians of note have appeared on both sides, such names as Budde,

Jensen, König, Jeremias, Hommel and Kittel are a sufficient evidence of that fact. But even much of their contribution to the discussion has been irrelevant, and much energy has been wasted fruitlessly in attempting to overthrow Delitzsch on his own ground. As an Assyriologist his work can scarcely be questioned. The proper question is: Do his results in Assyriological study form a sufficient basis for his conclusions in theology? Not that this has been overlooked by any means—cf. Budde, especially—but the need was felt for a thorough scientist who should be at once a master of the Babylonian legends and a theologian of the first rank.

For this reason the work of Prof. Gunkel appears most opportunely. Probably no one is better qualified to speak with authority on the matters involved. In his work "*Schöpfung und Chaos*" (1895) he displayed a most perfect acquaintance with the theology and legends of Babylonia and his critical handling of the material was such as to mark an epoch in the study of this subject. In 1900 he published the first edition (2nd in 1902) of his commentary on Genesis (in the Nowack series), which, beyond all question, is now the authoritative work on this book. His mastery of Babylonian mythology and its influence on the religion of the Old Testament needs no further demonstration than that afforded by this work.

In making the present translation two points have been borne in mind. In the first place it has been made to conform to the original as closely as possible. Hence what is to our eyes an unusually lavish use of

italics and exclamation points. The long paragraphs have been interfered with but little, but occasionally it has been necessary to split some sentence into two or three. In the second place, remembering that the results of the higher criticism are not very familiar to most persons in this country, many notes have been inserted (in square brackets) to explain references known usually to the expert alone.

The name "Yahwè" (Jehovah) has been represented usually by J", following a common custom in England. All quotations from Delitzsch have been made to correspond to the English translation of Mr. Johns as closely as possible, even when Gunkel differs in slight details from the original. Biblical quotations are given in the form of the Authorized Version.

For the sake of those wishing to pursue the matter further it may be added that the Code of Hammurabi has been translated by Mr. Johns under the title "The Oldest Code of Laws in the World" and forms a very inexpensive volume. The El-Afmarna Tablets have been published in English (besides other more elaborate editions) by Lieut.-Col. Conder in a popular form. A sufficient guide to the literature on the Babel and Bible controversy will be found in the *Expository Times* for the last two years—more at length as regards special monographs in the other theological reviews.

* * * * *

A word or two may not be out of place respecting Mr. Johns' introduction to his translation of *Babel und Bibel*. In the *Expository Times* for October of the present year he says (p. 44) : "When I wrote the introduction, I

27

tried to avoid giving any indication of my own views on the points raised by Prof. Delitzsch." If Mr. Johns' own views are hostile to Prof. Delitzsch, he assuredly has met with unqualified success, for a more appreciative introduction it rarely has been my lot to read. It is the duty of the student who claims to be neutral not merely to content himself with expatiating on the excellencies of the work before him but to use at least some endeavor to point out possible weaknesses. This Mr. Johns has made not the least attempt to do and the most casual reading of his introduction will dispose of the plea "purely objective." Every virtue of *Babel und Bible* has been indicated, *et voilà tout*.

On p. xxvi, we read : "If these lectures are to be answered the Professor must be met on his own ground." That is perfectly true if an answer to the purely scientific problem of the reading and knowledge of tablets is meant. But the controversy was not aroused by reading tablets. The question is : Do the results of Assyriological science destroy the possibility of a unique revelation in the Old Testament? That is what the controversy is about and there Prof. Delitzsch is on anything but his own ground. If a total disregard of the principles used in studying the history of religion, if a complete ignorance of anything but the broadest outlines of Old Testament criticism, coupled with a blunder in quoting the New Testament that a German school-boy should be ashamed to make, prove anything, they certainly prove that in *theology*, Prof. Delitzsch is most emphatically not on his own ground. He has placed himself in a domain where he is not at home.

with the results to be expected. LaPlace was a most wondrous mathematician, but his career as a politician is memorable. Prof. Delitzsch is perhaps the foremost of Assyriologists. Let us hope he will not try to be anything else.

THE TRANSLATOR.



ISRAEL AND BABYLON

FOR something over a year the German public has been set in commotion over the theme "Babel and Bible." How are we to explain the sensation that the lectures of Delitzsch have called forth? This is a question that certainly demands consideration. For, in the first place, that first lecture, from which the agitation of the public took its start, offers nothing, as far as regards its scientific material, but what was known generally to all Assyriologists and to all students of Old Testament theology as well—a fact that is granted on all sides. In other words, the lecture was, and evidently claimed to be, only a fuller and more perspicuous review of the present results. In order to explain the sensation which so suddenly arose, it is necessary to remember the conditions under which our public writers exist. The daily press lives in its own manner from day to day on "events." A development that goes on slowly and quietly escapes notice easily, but if a sudden and fortuitous occurrence brings matters to the surface, then the events become all at once "events" and remain so until something else more "eventful" suppresses them. So it has happened that our newspapers had taken small notice of the quiet but greatly growing science of Assyriology, in much the

same way as they—to their disgrace be it said—have studied to ignore scientific theology in general (albeit that there are a few noteworthy exceptions, particularly of late). Whatever can be read in the daily papers on such things (and especially on Old Testament subjects) is usually of the smallest scientific value. And this is not excused by the fact that many educated persons, including those of the highest circles—aye, even many University teachers (as is evident from time to time)—men with whom we teach from day to day and from room to room—that even such as these know nothing of the existence of an earnest scientific theology; have no conceptions of the method of our work, and are ignorant of the results of that work despite all our endeavors to popularize them. And with this universal ignorance of the *science* of religion, *dilettanteism* is in full bloom as it is scarce elsewhere. Many hold opinions on religion without being able to join in a conversation on the least technical topic. What we experience anew each day in this regard is “pitiful, most pitiful.” So we can observe how even investigators, who in their own domain are quite sober and temperate, suddenly lose their balance when they come to discuss religious subjects. And now the Babylonian investigators on Biblical subjects have suddenly become “events,” as if a light-bearer from above had deluged them all at once with a stream of radiance. All the world devoured this lecture, which the highest person of our state caused to be delivered before him twice. But the less the public had understood of these things before, the greater was its astonishment now to see an

entire sunken world rise here to the light of day. Unfortunately, Delitzsch had neglected to state in the text of his lecture and in wholly unequivocal terms that the material gathered by him is in all essentials (and especially in so far as it is assured) a common possession of a whole generation of research. A part of the public—and perchance no small part—has consequently misunderstood him entirely, and regards his lecture as a most remarkable scientific achievement. Likewise, *ecclesiastical circles* have been agitated violently. Delitzsch had avowed the results of the modern Old Testament study; he had, for instance, designated as a scientifically irrefragable and enduring fact the assertion that the Pentateuch is composed of literary sources very different in kind. He had asserted a primitive Babylonian origin for some of the most familiar portions of the traditions of Israel—in especial for the narratives of creation, the deluge, and even of Paradise—and accordingly declared himself of the opinion that these stories are to be regarded as myths and legends, but not as objective descriptions of real events. The Sabbath, likewise, is of Babylonian origin, and for monotheism itself an analogy is to be found there.

Now with all these assertions Delitzsch did not say much more than is generally admitted among investigators or is, at least, under discussion. But, in spite of that, his words affected many in the fold like a thunderbolt. Many things may come into consideration to explain so unexpected a result. But the principal cause is, after all, the lamentable estrangement of the evangelical Church from evangelical science. The

origin of this estrangement and the source of blame for it need not be discussed here,—let be granted only the fact itself; it is unfortunately indisputable. How few among the educated persons of the community, yes even among the older clergymen—and not only among the *older* clergymen—have a clear conception of what is actually happening in the scientific theology of the present! It is this that makes it possible for these “Bible-Babylonian” researches, when once they have become known, to surprise the Church and find it almost weaponless. In this case the Church should have employed a conservative and rigorous theology, which could indicate what part of Delitzsch’s assertions is correct and what is perhaps exaggeration, but even if many cautious words *were* spoken, none the less the voices of the excited partisans rose much higher. The one side called out: ‘The Bible is disposed of, once and for all, —Assyriology has proved that all its fundamentals are Babylonian! And the other fought with the energy of despair to admit only a tittle of Israel’s religion as adopted from foreign sources. And between these two extremes a bewildering multitude of opinions, reflecting back in a myriad of forms the whole chaos of our strenuous age. Even modern Judaism arose in a fright at losing the aureole of the chosen people, if Israel’s traditions were of Babylonian origin. Personal amenities (that mayhap had been better avoided) were added. There rained thick on more or less prominent sides articles in newspapers and journals, lectures illustrated and lectures unillustrated, brochures of every description, while explanations or other articles in the dailies

goaded up the discussions anew whenever slackening. An unutterable mental confusion was the result.

And this confusion has been still further increased by the recently delivered second lecture of Delitzsch. To be sure, as far as regards matter, this lecture also brought nothing especial to the expert, but now the Assyriologist, irritated by his ecclesiastical opponents, took up his position in the domain of theology and summarily placed in question the revelation of the Old Testament and the religion of Israel itself.

But on the very day when this lecture was issued the public was astonished by another great sensation,—a letter of the Emperor's destroyed the wide-spread error that Delitzsch's principal assertions were accompanied in all their bearings by the very highest approval. So the attention of the widest circles was drawn again to this discussion and the flood of publications began once more. And now a third lecture is to be expected, of which we read here and there mysterious hints.

So the author of these lines likewise has felt it his duty not to refuse the many appeals that have come to him, and on his part to assist in helping to quiet the growing confusion. Many considerations might certainly have decided him rather to silence than to speech, for scientific investigation seeks quiet and abhors sensation, and hard as it may be to the investigator that no one notices his painstaking work, yet it is dangerous when the tumult of the day rages about him and may drown out what is best in him,—the pure and just intention which is needful to him before all. Let us say then, once and for all, in all honesty and truth : "With -

favor to none and with malice to none!" The author may assume that many readers will be astonished or amazed by some or other of his words, although he plans in general not to go beyond what he can assume to be the general conviction of his colleagues. But he also begs the readers, if they are of a different opinion in many things, at least to *believe* that he seeks the truth with all his might, and that in expressing it to a greater circle he has no wish but to serve our beloved Evangelical Church.

In the first place, a few words on *Babylonian civilization* in general. The decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions is one of the most brilliant achievements of the human intellect. Since that time our view of the ancient and the most ancient Orient have altered completely. While the investigators of earlier generations were bound to the scanty information of the Old Testament and of the Greeks regarding the Orient, we now know it from native sources, and these sources begin, at the latest, about 3000 B. C.! The history of our race has been extended two whole millennia before our eyes! What a mighty scientific event! And how many-colored an historical picture it is that unrolls itself before our eyes, fragmentary though it may be for the present! People appear, flourish and pass away! Tremendous, world-embracing conqueror-states arise and struggle for the supremacy. But the middle-point of the Orient is Babylonia—there since inconceivable ages past, an amazingly high civilization reigned, which by 3000 is found already in full bloom. This culture comes from a non-Semitic people, whom we term

Sumerians, and is then taken up and carried on by Semitic immigrants. And from Babylonia this culture was carried forth through the entire Orient as far as Egypt. Babel takes in the Orient the position of Rome thousands of years later in the Occident. This Babylonian culture we see operating in the world up to Graeco-Roman times, in fact, its last traces we have in our very midst. A few particulars here must suffice to make clear the immeasurable importance of the Babylonian civilization. Recently the scientific world has been surprised by the discovery of the law-book of the Babylonian king Hammurabi, dated about 2250; this law-book shows us complicated social relations and a code embodying refined and developed distinctions, which, in part, were far more civilized than those of Israel in the so-called Mosaic code. For instance, in Babylon the law of blood-revenge has disappeared, while it still rules in ancient Israel. Or, to name just one other point that shows the height of the Babylonian culture, the Hammurabi code contains regulations for physicians' fees! And this law was codified about 2250; it comes from a time a thousand years before there was any people of Israel at all. It is as far removed from Moses as we are from Charlemagne!

In order to illustrate the wide extent of the Babylonian influence, let us name another discovery which a few years ago threw a sudden light on these things—the discovery of Tell-Amarna in Egypt. In that place the archives of Amenophis IV were excavated, and in them was revealed the correspondence of the Pharaohs with the kings in Babylonia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Cyprus

The Hammurabi Code, 1875-1880, by Dr. J. H. M. de Meulen.27

and with the Egyptian vassals in Canaan. From this international correspondence, which was carried on in the Babylonian language, it was seen that Babylonian was then the international diplomatic language of all hither Asia. The petty kings of Canaan themselves, who then lived under Egyptian suzerainty, wrote to the Egyptian lord not on Egyptian material, *i. e.*, papyrus, nor in the Egyptian language, but on Babylonian material, *i. e.*, on stone tablets, and in the Babylonian language! Let us consider what the predominance of a foreign language in diplomatic communications must mean for the entire civilization. Syria and Canaan must then have been subject to the influence of Babylonian culture, in much the same way, perhaps, as in the eighteenth century the whole refined world—and the diplomats as well—spoke French! This correspondence, however, which displays an extension of the Babylonian civilization as far as Canaan, dates from the time 1500–1400. Canaan was, as concerns its culture, a Babylonian province, before Israel had forced its way into the country.

Another picture: In later times, when Persians, Greeks and Romans mingled, when religions became interwoven and new composite concepts arose, in those times also the Babylonian element is still visible, we hear then once more, and continually, of seven highest Genii or gods—these are the seven Babylonian planet-gods—these are the same forms (to assume this here in advance) which in the Hebrew-Christian tradition remain as the seven highest angels—the seven archangels. In the varied speculations which streamed

in from the Orient during the first two Christian centuries, and even gained a foothold in some few Christian circles—speculations which we choose to term “Gnostic”—in these, there still reëcho traces of the (in part) primitive Babylonian mythology. Yes, even among us there are a few things that recall the Babylonian wisdom, although of course but weakly. The Babylonians became the teachers of our whole cultured world, especially in astronomy and in all branches dependent on it—in mathematics and metrics. We likewise still divide the zodiac into twelve signs and the circle into 360 degrees. And modern Christians still call the seven days of the week after the seven planet-gods of the Babylonians: Sunday [Samas], Monday [Sin], Tuesday [French, *Mardi*, Ninib or Kāivānu], Wednesday [French, *Mercredi*, Nabû], Thursday [Marduk], Friday [Istar], Saturday [Gunkel writes this in English, Nergal]. [Note: Kāivānu and Nergal were later interchanged.] These names are obtained by the modern world through the Graeco-Roman civilization, but the latter obtained them from the Orient—originally from Babylonia.

It is conceivable that modern investigators should be intoxicated, so to say, by contemplating such a tremendous history. And every day may bring new discoveries, for we certainly are not yet at the end of these researches. There are still whole libraries of stone tablets under the earth awaiting the happy discoverer, and even of those already found only a part have been read and given their due value. So we understand how Assyriology reaches out on all sides in an ecstasy

of youthful and ardent possession of power, how it investigates according to Babylonian standpoints the Grecian and the Roman civilization, and the religion of Israel also. That the older sciences resist such Babylonizing attempts is conceivable enough; Greek scholars, for example, will not soon be able to convince themselves to admit as imported from the Orient much that, until now, they have regarded as natively Hellenic. But in spite of all opposition, we may safely assume that such investigations will come in the future, as far as they have not come already, and will bear fruit for science. On the other hand also it is to be borne in mind that trees do not grow up to the heavens. The result will assuredly not be that the whole world is Babylonian at the bottom. As considerable as the Babylonian influence may be, perhaps more considerable still than we can suspect at present, yet even at the present time it may be said with all safety that the great nations of antiquity, who have come later than the Babylonians, on whose foundation our spiritual culture is built,—especially Israel, Hellas, and Rome—that these, in spite of occasional and perchance deep-reaching Babylonian influence, have preserved their own especial characteristics.

And so we come to our proper theme: *What influence has the Babylonian world had on Israel, especially on the Israelitic religion?*

But with this we enter a domain where Old Testament theology, which until now could give only references, has a full right to enter the discussion with a voice of weight. It is necessary to state this explicitly. For some Assyriologists—we say it with regret—have as-

sumed towards the older science of the Old Testament a tone of their own, as if the only legitimate way to the understanding of Israel from now on lay through Assyriology, and as if in Old Testament research Assyriology could dispense with the aid of the theologian. Even Delitzsch, in spite of the words of high appreciation, which he at first expressed for our science,¹ in the later stages of the debate, when he was certainly much irritated by uncomprehending antagonists—and this should not be overlooked—has not kept himself entirely free from this tone.² But now the fact really is that Assyriology embraces already an almost immeasurable domain, and that, on the other hand, Old Testament investigation lays claim on the whole powers of an ordinary mortal, so that only to a genius for whom there are no such restrictions would it be possible really to unite both fields. We Old Testament theologians are accordingly admonished to learn from the Assyriologist when he teaches matters Babylonian, even when he explains the usages of the Hebrew language from the Babylonian. But on the other hand we have the right to insist that the Assyriologist likewise keep within the boundaries of his own science. The Assyriologist, who in any way compares Israelitic matters with Babylonian and seeks to draw a conclusion from the comparison, places himself in a realm where he, ordinarily, is no expert in the full sense of the word. *And he should bear that in mind.* Even "Hebraic philology" gives no real inner understanding of the religion of Israel. So both subjects are in a friendly relation, befitted for working together. We wish with all our heart that both sciences

may reach each other the hand afresh for the common task, where each honors the other and strives to learn from the other. May the Assyriologist, who wishes to speak on Old Testament matters, call the theologian into consultation if he does not feel himself absolutely firm in this subject! So Delitzsch, whom we prize highly as Assyriologist and Hebraic philologist, would have done well, perhaps, if he had used the advice of some expert and cautious specialist in the Old Testament before he offered his opinion on Old Testament religion to the general public. Perhaps the specialist would have pointed out to him in time where some linguistic oversight had escaped him,³ or where he had quite omitted to consult the original text.⁴ He would not have allowed hazardous opinions concerning the interpretations of many Biblical passages to escape him [Delitzsch],⁵ or otherwise would have pointed out incorrect or dubious assertions of all kinds,⁶ he would have taken pains to explain our understanding of the Old Testament by the history of religion,⁷ he would have tried to show him [Delitzsch] that he far undervalued the Old Testament religion, and he would have warned him against entering into questions of systematic theology. If Delitzsch had followed all this advice, the first lecture would have taken a different form in many things, and the second would not have been delivered at all, to the profit both of the subject and assuredly of Delitzsch!

Let us for the moment now leave religion out of the question, and let us ask whether we may assume *an influence of Babylon on the culture of Israel?* To this question we may with all certainty answer *yes*. The

influence is evident and must in fact have been very great. In Israel there were, before all, Babylonian systems of measure, weight and money. Babylonian is the striking preference of the civilization of Israel—even of the literature—for particular numbers, *e. g.*, seven and twelve, a preference which in Babylonia is explained from the fact that particular numbers are characteristic of particular planet-gods. And the very tendency of Israel to group literary productions according to these numbers has been proved for Babylon: the great Babylonian creation-epic was written on seven tables, and the national epic of Gilgames on twelve. New surprises are brought by the code of Hammurabi, the Babylonian individual also followed the precept: "Eye for eye and tooth for tooth."⁸ Like the Israelite, he performed the ceremony of adoption by pronouncing the words: "Thou art my son,"⁹ and he denied his subjection to another by saying: "Thou art not my father nor my lord."¹⁰ When Laban and Jacob go to law with each other, the legal basis of their compact is Babylonian law; in case of the death of a sheep by wild beasts, the damage is borne by the owner;¹¹ and he who accuses another of theft has the right to institute a search of the other's house before witnesses.¹² Just so in case of barrenness, the Babylonian married woman, like the ancient Hebrew woman, can give her husband a maid that she may so raise up children.¹³ The story of the slave Hagar, who so became a mother and exalted herself over her mistress,¹⁴ is a striking example of Babylonian law.¹⁵ But enough of details! We see sufficiently from these few that Israel has not remained free from Babylonian influence.

Likewise the epochs in which Babylonia has especially affected Israel can be given; in chief is the period of the height of the Assyrian kingdom, about 660, when the Babylonian gods, as gods of the Assyrian realm, were esteemed in the whole circle of nearer Asia the mightiest divinities. That is the time when even Egyptian cities bore officially Babylonian names and when the Babylonian gods were revered by the state of Judah; their emblems and altars stood then in the temple of J" on Zion. And the Judaeans again came under Babylonian influence when Nebuchadnezzar deported all "the officers and the mighty of the land" to Babylonia and so brought them into the immediate sphere of Babylon. Post-exilic Judaism is completely subjugated by the influence of this civilization in all domains of the external life. In the centuries following the exile the people had actually forgotten its native tongue and adopted the Aramaic language, which was then ruling in the whole culture of the Semites. It has become finally in this way a completely different nation, which to the old Israelite people is bound by only a slender thread.

But much weightier than deductions from these later epochs is a fact which we know from the Tell A~~f~~marna letters, namely that Canaan already was permeated most thoroughly by Babylonian influence before the entrance of Israel. Accordingly when Israel entered Canaan and grew up into the old Canaanite civilization it came by that means indirectly under the rule of Babylonian civilization. Therefore it is no surprise to us if the oldest stories, such as those just mentioned of Jacob

and Laban, of Hagar and Sarah, presuppose Babylonian legal conditions.

And this influence never ceased entirely, for Israel's territory lay on the great commercial roads, which led from Babylonia to Egypt. On such great roads the merchants travelled with their wares, the conquerors with their armies, but there travelled likewise ideas, myths, legends and religions. And that the Babylonian religion so travelled to Canaan is no assumption but something which we can confirm by examples: the mountain Sinai probably is named after the Babylonian moon-god Sin, and Mount Nebo, where Moses died, is named after the Babylonian Nebô (i. e. Mercury.)

On the other hand it certainly would be very perverse to represent that Israel was *nothing else* than a Babylonian province. Egypt with its primevally old civilization, which rivalled the Babylonian, lay surely much too near for it not to have had an effect likewise; Egyptian policy indeed at various times had reckoned Canaan and Syria as part of its own domain. We need recall only the rôle which Egypt and Egyptian life played in the story of Joseph to recognize how much ancient Israel had busied itself with Egypt. But that the Hebrew, together with the allied Phoenicians and Aramaeans, had something of their *own* in their civilization is evidenced most clearly by the fact that they possessed their *own writing*; they wrote in neither Egyptian nor Babylonian. And it is well known that tendencies towards affinity reveal themselves in all civilization most clearly in the writing. Accordingly we must guard ourselves here, too, from exaggeration.

Let us now ask whether *the religion of Israel also displays Babylonian traces?* That the historian has the right, yes, even the duty—to open this question, can, after the above, surely suffer no doubt. But may theology as such, may we as Christians, who believe in the revelation of God in the religion of Israel, may we take part in such undertakings? Does not faith in God's revelation fall away if we find Babylonian elements in this religion? Orthodox opponents of Delitzsch have answered these questions affirmatively and have striven with all energy against the assumption of Babylonian elements in the Bible. But the extremists on the other side are of the same opinion also, and for just that reason are rejoicing over the downfall of the Bible and religion. What then is our position to be as opposed to this? A faith—we must say—that is worthy of the name must be *brave* and *bold*. What kind of a faith would that be which is afraid of facts, which abhors scientific investigation! If we really believe in God, Who reveals Himself in history, then we are not to dictate to the Highest what the events are to be in which we find Him, but we have only to kiss humbly His footprints and to revere His dealings in history. If we have to alter our views of God's ways in history, because the facts teach us, well, we simply have to do so!

If then we should find real Babylonian elements in the history of Israel, yes, even if they were absolutely important and weighty matters, yet our faith should nevertheless *rejoice* that the world is opening itself to us and that we see God's rule where we formerly had not sus-

pected it. Judaism, in which matters religious and national always are closely connected, may be anxious lest a pearl be stolen from its crown; but what are the national claims of Judaism to us? We acknowledge cheerfully and honestly God's revelation wherever a human soul feels itself near its God, even though that be in the most arid and strange forms. Far be it from us to limit God's revelation to Israel! "The seed is sown on the whole wide land!" How much more nobly than the modern conservatives have thought the Fathers of the Christian Church, who in the great and noble heroes of Greek philosophy have seen bearers of the seed of the divine Word, seed sown everywhere. Let us Christians not likewise commit the impertinence of Judaism, which thinks to honor its God by despising and abusing all other religions. To use a picture from the Bible, the Israelite-Christian religion is the first-born among its brothers. We truly have no need to defend our own brothers jealously—we ought to be great-minded enough to recognize—and even among those old Babylonians—what there is to recognize. The height and majesty of the religion of Israel will not thereby be lessened, but thus for the first time be placed properly in the light.

But in any case, let it be as it may, we are resolved to hear the facts, not to resist them inwardly, but to submit to them willingly. And therein lies our honor as investigators.

In the first lecture Delitzsch has named a series of points in which the Babylonian religion has influenced supposedly that of Israel; these are in the first place

Biblical stories—of the deluge, of the creation, and of Paradise. These are said to have come by Babylonian transmission. How does the case stand?

The story of the *deluge* is quite indubitably of Babylonian origin.¹⁶ Almost all modern investigators—Assyriologists and Old Testament scholars—agree in this, and if isolated, all too anxious theologians struggle against this indisputable conclusion, they may well consider whether they do not do the cause of faith they defend more harm than good. Alas for theology and alas for our church as well, if it takes up the profession of closing its eyes to obvious facts!

The facts of the case are as follows: The Babylonians, too, have a story of the deluge whose whole design coincides in a remarkable manner with both the Biblical accounts—*both*, for there are in Genesis *two* stories of the deluge [J and P] which have been worked together by a third hand. The weightiness of the subject requires that we pause here a little longer. The Babylonian story, which has come down to us in a wonderfully poetic form, tells how once the gods decided to destroy the town Surippak (situated probably at the mouth of the Euphrates). But Ea, the god of wisdom, wished to save his favorite Uṭ-Napistim, who in wisdom was of equal birth with his patron god. But inasmuch as Ea did not dare disclose the counsel of the great gods to a man, he adopted a stratagem: he appeared to the man in the night, while he was sleeping by the wall of his reed-house, and commanded the *house*, the *wall*, to build a ship! But the man, wise as his god, understood the puzzle. He built the ship. The con-

struction is described minutely. The ship is divided into different sections; within are stored all manner of silver and gold, seeds of every kind, his family and his relatives, cattle and even artisans. The last feature should be noted, which shows us that a civilized people is telling this story; according to another Babylonian recension, the hero of the tale had actually buried writings in order to save them until the flood passed. In the following it is told, in poetic, strongly mythical features, how the deluge comes. At the appointed time Ut-Napistim himself goes into the ship. A black cloud mounts up; that is the thundercloud of the god Hadad. Nebo and Marduk stride in advance, the Anunnaki raise their torches aloft. The waters rise and break loose on the men. The gods themselves are terrified by the fearful flood; they flee on high to Amis, heaven, and cower down there like dogs. Istar, the divine mother of men, cries loudly, and all the gods weep. Finally the flood ceases. Ut-Napistim opens the window; he looks out and laments over the destruction of the world. The ship has settled firmly on a northern mountain. To learn whether the land is dry he sends out birds three times. First a dove, which, however, finds no resting place and hence returns. Then a swallow. Finally a raven. The raven sees the water receding and does not come back.

That shows Ut-Napistim that the earth is now dry; he leaves the ship and first of all offers a sacrifice. But the gods smell the savor and swarm like flies about the sacrificer. Even Bêl, the chief instigator of the flood, draws near. Istar reproves him for doing so. Bêl

grows angry as he sees the men who have survived the deluge. Ea admits in some part that he has occasioned the rescue, and represents to Bél with vigorous irony his folly in producing the flood. Finally Bél reconsiders and displays his favor to the rescued one by raising him among the gods. [A comparison of the story in full as given here (or in any other work) with the portions used by Delitzsch (tr. pp. 42 seq.), is interesting. It is scarcely courteous to accuse a scientist of garbling, but an unfortunate impression of that nature is liable to arise in the minds of the reader. Delitzsch's "and so on" (p. 45) certainly covers a great deal.]

This Babylonian story has been described here thus fully in order that the reader may recognize for himself its remarkable similarity to the Biblical account, but at the same time its equally great divergence. In the first place, the points of contact: the similarity in the course of the event is obvious at once—in spite of all divergences in detail the substance of the story is the same as a whole. Particularly striking is the coincidence of both stories in the sending forth of the birds. How the heart of the first discoverer of the Babylonian narrative must have beaten when he came to this passage. Also the contact is remarkable in that at the close a sacrifice is offered and that the gods *smell* the sacrifice. Other points occur as well, such as that in the second Hebraic source [P] as in the Greek-Babylonian tradition Ararat (i.e., Armenia) is named as the landing-place of the ark, and that the hero of the deluge in both cases is the tenth of his line, Noah the tenth of the patriarchs, Ut-Napis-tim the tenth of the kings. Accordingly a relation must

exist between the two *narratives*. If we now consider the inconceivable age of Babylonian civilization and of this deluge narrative as well, if we remember that floods are very natural precisely in Babylonia, which lies close to the sea and is a flat plain watered by great streams, we cannot doubt that the Israelite story came from the Babylonian. [Perhaps not entirely conclusive, but the statement is altogether probable.] The Babylonian narrative of the great flood has gone through the world of hither Asia. We now have, in fact, the oldest representation of Noah's ark from an excavation of ancient Etruria! A well-known attempt at evading this conclusion should never have been made,—that, due to over-anxious temperaments and still appearing occasionally, in which it is assumed that the Hebraic account is not dependent on the Babylonian but that both are versions of the same events. For to every student of legend it is quite indubitable that the narratives, which coincide so in minor traits, must be related *as narratives*.

We say "to the student of legends." For this conclusion also is unavoidable, that the Hebrew tradition, if we derive it thus from the Babylonian, is not an historical narrative in the strict sense, but is poetic, popular, i. e., a legend. And, indeed, it is not only Assyriology that teaches us this, but the fact is evinced by entirely other characteristics, and should have been long obvious to every one who lays claim to education and good taste! The deluge account is a legend, is poetry, even as there are many kinds of poetry and many kinds of legends, too, in the Old Testament. That is not the judgment of irreligion and unbelief, but a judgment which is en-

tirely compatible with piety and true devotion, for legends are the most precious treasure which an ancient people possesses, and they are particularly fitted to express the thoughts of religion. What a melancholy spectacle it is, if the anxious piety of certain circles, in sad combination with a pitiful lack of culture, is afraid of the poetry of the Old Testament, the noblest poetry in the world! But churches and schools henceforth should not leave to unbelievers the task of explaining to our people the legendary portions of the Old Testament. There is a pressing need that at least in the upper classes of the higher schools, as soon as the possibility of historical intelligence has become manifest in the scholars, it should be shown by some prominent examples that poetic narratives are contained in the Old Testament and to this purpose the deluge story might serve as a particularly clear instance.

We therefore, agree absolutely with Delitzsch, when he assumes the dependence of the Biblical account of the flood upon the Babylonian; indeed, we regard it as no small merit of Delitzsch that he has been courageous enough to announce in the presence of that illustrious assembly this result of research and, at the same time, to acknowledge without reserve his adherence to the modern criticism of the Pentateuch.¹⁷ And the merit, which Delitzsch has so obtained for himself by popularizing investigation we shall not forget, even if we cannot agree with him in many other matters. For we certainly dissent from him even in the question as to *how* this dependence is to be regarded. Delitzsch seems here as in other cases to incline to the opinion that the Bibli-

cal authors had the Babylonian legend lying before them in writing, and that it was translated and revised by them with full deliberation.¹⁸ This opinion has too external a relation to the subject and for the student of the history of legends does not come into consideration; much more probable to him is the assumption that the story came to Israel by oral tradition. And that this more natural assumption meets the case here equally well is proved by the various deviations of the legendary *material* in the Biblical and the Babylonian accounts. Thus, for example, the names "ark" and "flood" ["tebha" and "mabbûl"], which, it is safe to say, were not invented by the Hebrew writers, are different from the Babylonian.¹⁹ But much weightier than such an error is an omission which Delitzsch has disregarded. He has contented himself with establishing the *dependence* of the Biblical matter on the Babylonian, without including an investigation as to whether the Biblical account as opposed to the original has not also a certain *self-dependence*. And just on account of this omission, the impression might be created that the Biblical account, because dependent on the Babylonian, is *worthless*! In fact Delitzsch himself has spoken of "the purer and more original form"²⁰ of the Babylonian traditions. An ominous one-sidedness is this, inherent in Delitzsch's lectures, and on account of this he bears the chief blame in the reigning confusion! For where in all the world is it permitted merely to trace the origin of a subject without immediately adding, if it be at all possible, an investigation as to the manner in which the subject has been transformed? Our great German

poets have adopted repeatedly old material for their greater creations: Goethe's "Faust," for example, rests as everyone knows on an older German legend. But who thinks that Goethe's poetry becomes of less worth if we have pointed out to us the book of folk-lore as the source of "Faust"? On the contrary, his power is seen for the first time when we observe what he has made of the uncouth material. And so it is with the Biblical and Babylonian stories of the deluge. The difference between the two is almost immeasurable; they are different worlds which are expressed in them. In the Babylonian story, a wild, grotesque polytheism: the gods outscheme and combat one another, they quake before the flood and cower like dogs in the heaven, and they come like flies to the sacrifice. But the Biblical story speaks of the One God, Whose just retribution sends the flood, and Who graciously protects the just man after He has tried him. Therefore in the Biblical narrative there is lacking also a trait which is contained in the Babylonian, and which is perchance pleasing to modern sentimentalism, namely the sympathy of the hero for the drowned men. But what an exaggeration when Delitzsch asserts²¹ that the Babylonian legend, on account of this one feature, "appeals to us with far greater force than the Biblical narrative!" And our sympathy with this feature will be, moreover, markedly diminished when we add that it in no way occurred to the hero of the flood to warn his fellow-citizens, but rather—barbarously enough—instead of warning them, he announced to them a rich blessing and that on the advice of his god!

[!!] But the narrative of the Bible, which founds the deluge on the sins of mankind, is entirely too *earnest* to know pity for *justly* punished sinners. Accordingly the Israelite tradition had by no means simply adopted the Babylonian, but on the contrary it transformed the story with the utmost completeness; a true marvel of the world's history, it has changed dross into gold. Should not we then as Christians rejoice, that in these primitive Babylonian recensions we have found a line to measure how much nearer the God in Whom we believe was to ancient Israel than to the Babylonians? Truly, he who has a sense for religion and its history cannot overlook this potent difference between the two stories.

The state of the case for the *creation* narrative is similar, except that here the proof for the dependence of the Israelite tradition upon the Babylonian is much harder to produce. The creation narrative of the Babylonians tells how the world was originally a great sea, which the Babylonians, in the fashion of their mythology, represent as a powerful female primæval being, Tiâmat. From the union of Tiâmat, with the primæval father, Aprû, all the gods sprang. Now the myth tells how a strife arose between the younger and the older gods, until finally Marduk, the town-god of Babylon, overcame Tiâmat, cut her into two parts, and made heaven and earth from them. So the earth is formed from the primeval sea.—Whoever compares this primitive Babylonian myth with the first chapter of Genesis, will at first grasp scarcely anything but the infinite gulf between the two: on the one hand the heathen divinities, inflamed in a wild struggle

against one another; on the other the One Who speaks and it comes to pass. None the less, there are certain traces which make it probable to us that the Babylonian account lies behind the Biblical, even if both must have been severed by a very long space of time. The Hebraic account has several remnants which show us that it once must have been mythical; here also the world was originally water, and the expression *tehôm*, which is used here, is ultimately the same as the Babylonian *tiāmat*. And in the Hebraic account, also, the world is created so that the original primeval waters are divided into two parts, heaven and earth. Accordingly, in spite of all deviation in the religious ideas, a related material! Now here, too, the dependence of the Hebraic on the Babylonian is probable, for the manner in which the world arises here corresponds entirely to the Babylonian climate, in which in the winter, water holds sway everywhere, until the god of the spring sun appears, who parts the water and creates heaven and earth. But that the story of the strife of the light-god against the waters of the primeval age and against the wild monsters was known in Canaan likewise, is shown by certain references by prophets, poets, apocalyptists, where this struggle has been transferred to J'." Such references are valuable in this connection, because they represent the links between the grotesque Babylonian myth and the late Hebraic account of Genesis 1. Accordingly, we can assume also a dependence of Genesis 1 on the Babylonian account, as far as regards the matter, but the original far outweigh the adopted portions. Therefore, this

assumption as well serves only to show the peculiar height of the religion of Israel.

But again this consideration teaches that the story of creation, not otherwise than that of the deluge is a *poem*; that also is an acknowledgment against which no one to whom our church is dear should strive; it would not be too much to desire and the beginning of a highly necessary reformation, if in the book of Biblical history the first section should be headed: The Poem of Creation. May students consider this suggestion. There is still time. Perhaps the hour is coming when it will be said *too late*!

Likewise the tradition of the *patriarchs* up to the deluge is, as may be assumed with great probability, of Babylonian origin, the Hebraic names in part can be regarded as direct translations of the Babylonian kings. [Enos = man = amêlu; Cainan = smith = work-master = ummânu; Enoch corresponds to En-me-duran-ki in his attributes; Methusalah = man of Selah = man of Sin = amêl-sin (but Methusalah *may* mean "man of the javelin"). These names are the 3d, 4th, 7th and 8th in both lists, and the tenth in both is the hero of the flood, although his names in the two lists have no etymological connection.] This explanation is significant, because in this manner a light falls on the great ages ascribed to the patriarchs, which have given rise to such discussions; the Babylonian tradition contains in this place still greater numbers, and these are explained by an astronomical chronology of the world.

Of the primitive myths of the Bible, Delitzsch has

designated that of *Paradise* as Babylonian also, but only on the ground of an old Babylonian picture [on a cylinder-seal], whose meaning is entirely uncertain."² [Tr., p. 56, reproduces the drawing—also in many other works.]

Following Eberhard Schrader, Delitzsch further compares the legend of the *madness of Nebuchadnezzar*, who on account of his pride was driven from men and dwelt with the beasts of the field, with a Græco-Babylonian tradition, according to which the king, come to the height of his power, predicted a foreign conqueror and wished that he [the conqueror] might be hunted through the desert, where the wild beasts and birds roam about. Both traditions *have* a certain similarity, but this is certainly much too weak to admit of a dependence of the Biblical upon the Babylonian being safely asserted. [And most dogmatically it is by Delitzsch.] Much closer is the connection of the Jewish legend with the Babylonian of Eabani, who lived among the beasts like a beast; his hair covered his whole body, and spread out like wheat stalks, and he ate grass with the gazelles. And here, too, Delitzsch follows the superficial conception that the *writer* revised the foreign legend;" the question could be at the utmost of a transformation in *oral* tradition—I believe that all students of folk-lore will agree with me in that. But Delitzsch actually wishes that the Babylonian origin and "the purer and more original form of this story" should be imparted to the young as soon as they hear of the corresponding Biblical story! But the startling expression that we have been "burdened by tradition" by the representa-

tion of the madness of the "brutified" Nebuchadnezzar, ought to have been avoided in any case; did Delitzsch ever regard this story as anything *but* a legend?

Just so is everything that he marshals in so flowery a way on the origin of faith in a *life after death* dubious in the extreme. Much rather the ancient Babylonians and Hebrews agreed in the belief, that the soul after death enters into the dark under-world [Sheôl] from which there is no rescue for ordinary men. The belief in the resurrection does not yet belong in general to the Old Testament, but arose first in the post-canonical times and in any case not under the influence of the *old* Babylonian religion, [A *positive* statement regarding resurrection of the body appears first in Second Maccabees (7th, etc.), but the date is very uncertain and the book may be later than the Crucifixion. Resurrection (of Israel) is foretold in Daniel 12² (ca. 165 B. C.), and traces of the doctrine go back to Exilic time, but it never was held universally by Israel, cf. St. Matthew 22³, etc.]

It is correct that the *belief in angels* recalls Babylonian opinions, particularly in the belief as it appears in post-exilic Judaism; we can prove that for the seven arch-angels and surmise it for the Cherubim and Seraphim. But whether the belief in angels *as a whole* originated from Babylonia is another question, which may well be propounded provisionally, but which can scarcely be answered.

The derivation of the Hebrew Sabbath from the Babylonian has stirred up much dust. Here also we must warn the laity against unnecessary excitement, for what

is the Sabbath to us? The high and pure religion of Christianity, as it has been renewed in the Reformation of Luther, knows no holy days! [It might be well to add "*ex jure divino*."] Jesus boldly transgressed the Sabbath law, and the Apostle says: "Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." (Colossians 2¹⁶ [A V.] The Christian Sunday is not a transference of the Sabbath but something new and different. According to the history of religion, however, the case is this. The observance of such a holy day in the great historical religion is a remnant of an older time, when men believed in gods, who *according to their nature* belonged to certain days. From the Babylonian discoveries we have not learned the history of the origin of the Sabbath; for such institutions of a cult are generally much too old for so young a people as Israel to give an historic tradition of their origin. So it is not remarkable if even the oldest Israel knew as little of the origin of the Sabbath as of circumcision, abstaining from blood, and many other ceremonies.²⁵ But if there, nevertheless, exist in Israel explanation of such customs, as for the Sabbath the well-known explanation that the Sabbath is holy because God hallowed it by resting after the creation, so those explanations are supplied *afterwards*, and, while they may be as spiritual and deep as they may, they do not come into consideration for the explanation of the ceremonies themselves. Accordingly if we find among the Babylonians any parallel for the Sabbath, we shall simply rejoice over the enrichment of our knowledge. And such a parallel we certainly may

assume, even with some certain provisional reserve,²⁶ and suppose that the Hebraic Sabbath originated from Babylonia, the classic land for the honor of the planets and their characteristic days. But it is assuredly a great excess again when Delitzsch says that we owe the blessings contained in the Sabbath (or Sunday) rest to that ancient civilization.²⁷ For such days take, on the other hand, when they pass over into a different religion, an entirely different character! The ancient Babylonians observed the Sabbath as a fast-day, on which certain transactions should be avoided. The ancient Hebraic Sabbath contains nothing of such ideas but was held as a joyous holiday. And how can one actually say of Sunday that its wealth of blessings came originally from Babylon?

We pass over all these minor matters, of which very many more still might be named,²⁸ and come to the main question, whether and how far the Babylonians were *monotheists*. Here we must, in the first place, state that there have been different forms of monotheism in many people and at various times, but in spite of that the people of Israel is and remains the classic people of monotheism; this monotheism which we know, or more exactly, which was the precursor of ours, originates from Judaism; and in Israel this monotheism originated entirely independently [autochthon], we know the history of its origin in Israel very well. *The religion of Babylon is, on the other hand, indubitably polytheistic*, and in fact it has a thoroughly crass, grotesque pantheon. If then in Babylon something should be found that savors of monotheism, that is the exception. *The great*

historic effect which results from it is, in this point, not due to Babylon, but to Israel. Now Delitzsch has referred to several details; to begin with, to certain names compounded with, *el* = God, such as "God with me," "I call on God," "God is great," etc., which especially among Northsemitic immigrants were used at the time of Hammurabi. Delitzsch assumes that these North-semites were related to the Hebrews, and like these were monotheists from the oldest time; his opinion is accordingly in no way that the *Israelite* monotheism *originated* in Babylonia. And in the meantime all these combinations are without application, something Delitzsch could have learned from any student of the history of religion; for, *e. g.*, the polytheistic Greeks had names like Theophilos = dear to God, Theopompos = sent by God, Theodosios = gift of God, Theoxenos = guest-friend of God, etc. The likewise polytheistic Phœnicians, Aramæans, and Arabs, have very many names that are compounded with *el* = God: such as 'Aimel = eye of God, Channel = Grace of God, 'Aliel = God is exalted, etc.²⁹ In passing it may be remarked also that everything that Delitzsch observes regarding the Babylonian name Jahu-ilu, = J' is God,³⁰ is dubious in the extreme. The whole reading or meaning is, by the judgment of many co-specialists of Delitzsch, very questionable.³¹ But in the distinguished position in which Delitzsch spoke—this we ought not to refrain from saying—he should have been at special pains to utter only assured facts. Now there is still out of the Neo-Babylonian time a text in which different gods are made equivalent to Marduk [in different aspects],

and this, with Delitzsch, is certainly to be regarded as monotheistic.³² From this place it is shown that Babylonian priestly wisdom, at a certain point of history, has recognized that the different deities are at the bottom manifestation-forms of the same Divine Essence, a view which the Greek popular philosophy held also at the time of Jesus. We are glad at such a spiritual height, which towers aloft through all the confused folly of polytheism up to the One. Certainly such an understanding of the sages in Babylonia affected the religion proper even as little in Babylonia as in Greece, which religion has much rather remained in polytheism. So with this monotheistic *religion* of Israel this monotheistic *speculation* is to be compared only from afar.

The reader will have noticed that thus far we have spoken only of pure details. This has its good reason. For at present the Babylonian religion is known to us only fragmentarily, while the Israelite certainly lies before us clearly in its essential features and its historic epochs. So what we can give at the present, if we wish to discuss the influence of Babylonia on the religion of Israel, is then, at the most, that we define—and that naturally with all reserve—those *domains* in which a transfer of Babylonian, more or less religious matter to Israel can have taken place. Those are, before all, legends and myths; then institutions of civilization, which perhaps in wide extent are of Babylonian origin; then legal institutions, which indeed of old were connected always in some way with religion; so cosmology, the conceptions of the nature and divisions of the world; then popular beliefs as to heavenly, terrestrial,

and subterrestrial beings of all sorts, of angels and demons; then computations of the duration and epochs of the world, prophetic and apocalyptic picturings. The most valuable pieces are perhaps religious songs, which have wandered through the lands in company with certain things pertaining to culture; we have Babylonian psalms, which, even if vastly inferior religiously to the Hebraic, are none the less related to them in form. But the most of this material, at least in Israel, is connected but loosely with the proper religion, or else, as we have seen in the narratives of the Deluge and Creation, and as easily can be shown in the religious songs, has been made Israelitic in the strongest fashion. If we look on the essential and determinative facts, we must acknowledge that *Israel's religion in the classical period is independent from that of Babylon.*

Likewise a *parallel between the two religions* can not be drawn as yet. Delitzsch has tried it but has remained among details. And in the process—we appeal in this matter to the judgment of all students—he has conducted himself in an entirely *ex parte* manner; he exalts the Babylonian, and debases Israel as far as possible. So it is a great injustice when Delitzsch asserts that “the same naive representations of the godhead” are found in Israel and Babylonian [p. 175]: as in Babylon the gods eat and drink and even betake themselves to rest, so J’ goes forth in the cool of the evening to walk in Paradise, and takes pleasure in the sweet scent of Noah’s sacrifice. But now there can be no doubt in the unprejudiced judge that the idea the Babylonian had of God was *by far* more naive than the Israelitic; one need

think only of the manner in which the gods appear in the story of the deluge, where they cower like dogs in heaven. Even in the Old Testament there are occasionally marked anthropomorphisms, but these are in no way as crass as is customary in Babylon ; that J' eats and drinks never was said by historic Israel. Such downright anthropomorphisms are in the Old Testament *archaisms*, which have remained in the primeval legends of the Deluge and of Paradise, but which have been surmounted by the advancing religion. This conduct of Delitzsch may have been excusable on account of his being angered by the ignorant warmth of certain theological opponents. But *we* wish to be not partisan, but as objective and as just as possible. We have by no means the purpose to gloss over the obvious weaknesses of Israel, which occasionally come to expression in the Old Testament, and we have in no way the need of finding everything noble and fair in Israel. The Jewish monotheism, for example, this we frankly admit, is frequently sullied by a hate, and often a blood-red hate of the heathen, a fact that we may understand historically from the miserable condition of the continually oppressed Jews, but one which we in no case wish to adopt into our religion ; a bigot may defend the prayer "pour out Thy wrath upon the heathen" but not so we. On the other hand we certainly do not wish to combat what the Babylonians have achieved, least of all in religion. The hymns of the Babylonians to their great gods, which often rise to a high pitch, and their penitential psalms, in which not seldom a strong feeling of sin resounds, meet a receptive ear in us ; we rejoice over

the ancient, admirable civilization of this people, from whom Israel could have learned much. But if the Babylonian and the Biblical religions are to be compared, what neutral can doubt with which side he is to range himself? There the crass *polytheism*, here in the classical time *monotheism*; the Babylonian religion replete with witchcraft, which lies deep under the feet of the great prophets of Israel; there the cult of *images*, here strict iconoclasm in the Jewish worship³³; there the connection of the gods with nature, but here the religious thought raises itself in the classic period to the belief in One God, Who stands above the world; there the religious prostitution, which once overran Israel as well, but here is abhorred through the holy fury of the prophets! The fairest possession of Israel, however, is the theme of her prophets, that God desires no offering or ceremonies, but piety of the heart and justice of deeds; this most inner connection of religion with morality is before all the reason through which Israel's religion mounts exalted above all other religion of the ancient Orient! This is Israel's power over man and it remains so, even if Judaism has become again untrue to this mighty idea. And where has the Babylonian world forms like the great religious figures of the prophets, the indignant Amos, the majestic Isaiah, the deep and tender Jeremiah, to say absolutely nothing of Moses and Elijah. The prophets of Israel in the exile felt themselves high exalted above the religion of Babylon, which they had before their eyes, despite the pomp and parade with which it was clothed, despite that these gods were the gods of the world-kingdom, despite that Judah was

thrown in the dust. They certainly have not judged it *justly*, even as is wont to happen in the strife of religion, but fundamentally they were right. Bêl boweth down, Nebo stoopeth, but through the milleniums resounds the joyous shout of the Singer of Israel ; “ Who, O Yahwè, is like Thee among the gods ” ? The gods of the Babylonians passed away when their time came ; to the God of little Judea the hearts of the heathen turned when the time was fulfilled. This most mighty historical event, under whose influence the whole world-history afterwards is developed, must have had a most mighty cause ; and what is this cause, what else can it be than the decisive pre-eminence of this religion over the other ?

And now at the close of the question : may we continue to speak of the *revelation of God in Israel* ? Delitzsch has denied it. In this regard it is surely seen most clearly that a special knowledge of theology proper is lacking in him ; his position therefore, lacks clearness and firmness ; we will try to make his attitude clear, in the hope of dealing correctly with at least the vital point. The conception of revelation, which he postulates, is the *supernatural*, old-ecclesiastical theory, which men still are accustomed to associate popularly with this word. According to this, revelation stands in mental [begrifflich] contrast to everything human ; the theory that the Old Testament religion is “ revelation ” consequently excludes in this sense all human co-operation and historical development. Delitzsch is at pains to combat this theory that the Old Testament religion in such a sense rests upon revelation, and he does it by pointing to all kinds of contradictions and difficulties

in the Old Testament. For instance, he shows that the God, Who despises all external sacrifice, according to testimony of the prophets, could not possibly have prescribed the ceremonial law of the later Jewish work known as the "Priests' Code." Or he points to the numerous heathen parallels which there are for Old Testament laws,—Sabbath, new-moons, shewbread, circumcision are the property not only of Israel but of other people as well. Or he shows that there are also purely secular works in the Old Testament, such as the Song of Songs, a collection of Hebraic love-songs, which can scarcely have anything at all to do with religion. We may adopt this reasoning of Delitzsch most properly, even if we must make exception in some particulars. We hail Delitzsch as a colleague in the battle against the delusion of assuming that the Old Testament is verbally inspired, as though its religion were in some way fallen from heaven, and had grown without human aid and without history. Only, most assuredly, we hail him without burdening ourselves in any way with this, largely superficial and even uncivil, argument. For this colleague comes somewhat late. The theologian who knows the history of his science knows that such polemics against supernaturalism have existed for two centuries, and often have been uttered with much greater material than the scanty store that Delitzsch has hastily raked together. And these century-old polemics bore their fruits years ago. The opponents whom Delitzsch combats exist no more—at least not in academic circles; and the doors he breaks apart with such beautiful zeal have stood open for years. Theology has on all sides dropped

that orthodox belief in inspiration, and dropped it long ago. Likewise the belief that the ancient Israelite religion has arisen not historically but *purely super-historically, super-naturally*, is defended by hardly a single evangelical German theologian. That is not unknown even to Delitzsch. There are remnants of the old view yet at work, sometimes in circles that know not much of scientific theology; and frequently, even among theologians, the principal difference between the old supernatural theory and the modern based on the history of religion is not recognized with full clearness. People often satisfy themselves with half compromises. So we may leave Delitzsch unmolested in this opinion, only let him choose his terms more gently, as is befitting when one deals with such holy things, and let him not indulge in the opinion that he has "opened up" an important theological question.³⁴

But now Delitzsch thinks he has overthrown *revelation entirely* by proving "revelation" in this sense to be impossible. "Revelation" to him is nothing but the supernatural; he *does* know that another concept of revelation has existed among theologians for a long time; but he can regard this as only an "attenuation" of the old ecclesiastical belief.³⁵

What is the case regarding this modern conception of revelation? We say in advance that in discussing such a subject we shall leave the ground of historical science and speak on the question of how historical matter is to be judged from the standpoint of *religion, of faith*. Now the scientific theology of to-day believes it possesses a deeper understanding of revelation, according to which

the divine and the human do not exist together in mere *external* relations, but are bound together *internally*. The history of revelation proceeds therefore, among men, according to the same psychological laws as govern other human events. But in the depth of this development the eye of *faith* sees God, Who speaks to the soul, and Who reveals Himself to him who seeks Him with a whole heart. We recognize God's revelation in the great persons of religion, who receive the holy secret in their inmost hearts and announce it with tongues of flame; we see God's revelation in the great changes and wonderful providences of history. The faith of children thinks, of old and now, that God wrote the tables of the law with his own hand and passed them to Moses; the faith of the mature knows that God writes His commandments with His finger in the hearts of His servants.

Now have we the right to see such a revelation in Israel's religion? Surely! For what sort of a religion is it? *A true miracle of God's among the religions of the ancient Orient!* What streams flow here of all-overcoming enthusiasm for the majestic God, of deep reverence before His holy sway, and of intrepid trust in His faithfulness! He who looks upon this religion with believing eyes will confess with us: To this people God hath disclosed Himself! Here God was more closely and clearly known than anywhere else in the ancient Orient, until the time of Jesus Christ, our Lord! This is the religion on which we depend, from which we have ever to learn, on whose foundation our whole civilization is built; we are Israelites in religion even as we are Greeks in art and Romans in law. Then if the Israelites

are far beneath the Babylonians in many matters of civilization, none the less are they far above them in religion ; *Israel is and remains the people of revelation*. Now is that really an "attenuation" of the concept of revelation, as Delitzsch thinks? No, we believe that that is a *spiritualization and deepening of it*!

But psychologically Delitzsch may be understood as follows: In the circles from which he comes and in which he was formerly educated in theology, he acquired only a rather crass—or to say it in plain but vigorous language—a rather *mythological* concept of revelation. And now that he sees the untenability of such opinions, he turns against this conception with the zeal of wrath, without having really surmounted it in his heart and without having attained a satisfactory attitude towards both science and religion. Such a result is common in such cases. [Prof. Gunkel's reference seems to be to the late Franz Delitzsch, the father of the lecturer (Friederich Delitzsch.) He was one of the foremost scholars of the last generation in both Hebraic philology and Old Testament theology and is universally known as a commentator. His attitude was conservative but not uncompromisingly so, cf. p. 217 of "Babel and Bible." The present translator feels bound to say that if Prof. Gunkel could have avoided this apparent insinuation, it would probably add to the good temper of all parties concerned. However, the reference was needed to emphasize his argument here.] So during his year's truce [he was in Babylon] he allowed himself to be driven by his theological opponents into a much more dogmatic position than the one he assumed

originally; for in his first lecture he uttered the words that we have yet to free the religion of the prophets, psalmists, and Jesus, from "those purely human conceptions"³⁶ which still cling to it; at that time he seems to have believed still that the religion of the prophets, as a religion, was not "purely human." Even now he distinguishes in the Book of Jonah the "human form" from the proper content; the content, accordingly, if we understand Delitzsch rightly, is *not* "human."³⁷ It is quite inconceivable [does Gunkel mean *conceivable*?] that Delitzsch does not wish to cause harm to our faith in God and true religiousness by his denial of revelation³⁸; but is our faith in God imaginable without the belief that this God reveals himself to man in history? Or does Delitzsch acknowledge in Jesus an absolutely supernatural revelation? We may perhaps assume so from the manner in which he speaks of Jesus, in any case it will be a great inconsistency if he admits an exception into his philosophy of the universe. For that and not details is the real question. In one place Delitzsch holds that the modern theological conception—that all Divine revelation is through human intermediaries and hence is a gradual development—is his own as well.³⁹ So he is finally in complete agreement with us? But even on the same page⁴⁰ he revokes this view. And in another place he speaks of the revelation of God that we, each one of us, carry in our own consciences,⁴¹ which is, accordingly, even if very rationalistically expressed, a non-supernatural revelation, which he combats elsewhere. A very labyrinth of contradictions! On what theological height Delitzsch

stands is evinced by such utterances of his as : "*Is there then a belief besides the Biblical belief?*"—one does not believe his eyes when he reads it. Or actually: "Man-kind has certainly not *deserved* a personal Divine revelation on account of his trifling with the Ten Commandments"—what an impossible idea! For what have we, in any sense, "*deserved*" of God?

Accordingly, if we understand Delitzsch aright, he is a rationalist of the old school, who has freed himself from early supernaturalism and in exasperation fights this as his proper foe, although some bits of the shell of supernaturalism cling to him even now, but who has not yet arrived at the understanding that *history* is the proper field of revelation. We can not refrain from asserting that such an unhistorical rationalism is nearly the most arid conception of religion that has ever existed, and that previous to this we had indulged in the deception that such a theological position was demolished and would not reappear.

What will the future of the whole "Babel and Bible" movement be? We may prophesy with great safety. To the sensation there will succeed in not too far a time, indifference; a new "eventful" event will overthrow "Babel and Bible." Even Delitzsch's lectures, which neither have added new material nor have been able to say anything especially novel in theology, will soon be forgotten by the public; and future histories of science will hardly mention them. But what survives as a consequence of the whole disturbance is, we may hope, an enduring interest of the educated in Babylonian and Biblical investigations. For this we must thank De-

litzsch in spite of all the contradictions we have been compelled to give; only, hereafter, let interested persons make use of sober and scientifically unassailable publications. But at the same time there remains, we must fear, a mistrust in wide circles of the Church which has, alas, so long ignored theological science and its assured results. May the evangelical Church draw a lesson from the events of to-day, and become conscious of its task, to present to the community the faith in such a form that no historic criticism may assail it.

NOTES

[All references to the first lecture apply to the second edition, from which the English translation has been made.]

¹ I, p. 4 [p. 4].

² Only with mixed feelings can the utterance of Delitzsch in II, p. 14 [pp. 167-168] be read, according to which he expects from the Babylonian monuments—"which our Expedition will set to work to excavate"—a more notable and rapid advance in the linguistic elucidation of the Old Testament than has been possible for two thousand years. No one will be blamed for thinking highly of his own domain of investigation; and even if he over-prizes its value, such human weakness will readily be pardoned. But, at the same time, one must not ask too much patience of his neighbor. Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off.

³ Delitzsch speaks in I, pp. 38, 39 of *DEM Scheol* [masculine, an error lost in the English of p. 57]; the word is feminine.

⁴ Delitzsch cites in II, p. 26 [p. 188], *lô liqtôl*, "Thou shalt not kill;" as a matter of fact both places (Exodus xx. 13, Deuteronomy v. 17) read *lô tirsah*, "Thou shalt do no murder." [Not so in A. V., but cf. R. V.] "We scholars would count it a grave reproach to anyone of ourselves to render falsely or inaccurately, even in a single letter, the inscription of any one" (II, p. 21) [p. 180].

⁵ It is totally wrong, if Delitzsch, in the well-known passage, Genesis i. 27, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them," considers as possible a polytheistic coloring, distinguishing gods and goddesses. (I, p. 64) [p. 106]. This was certainly not the thought of the

rigidly monotheistic writer of Genesis i. [cf. any Old Testament introduction for the essential characteristics of P]; and, just as little, there is no ground whatever to regard this polytheistic coloring as the original thought in the material. Much rather it means simply: (1) Man is created in the image of God, (2) when the men were created they were male and female.

How Delitzsch can find in the passage Job xxiv. 18 the later Jewish concept of the two-fold recompense in the lower world is incomprehensible to me. (I, p. 39) [p. 59].

From Isaiah lxvi. 24 ("their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched") Delitzsch deduces that cremation, in the Old Testament, is thought of as standing entirely on the same level with inhumation; and the deduction is coupled with a wearying reference to modern times, for he concludes from this passage that there is not the slightest opposition to cremation from the Biblical side (I, p. 69) [p. 120]. But this conception of the passage is wrong; for it is very well known to us that the ordinary, honorable form in ancient Israel was burial, while the burning of the body was regarded as a horrifying shame. [Cf. Leviticus xx. 4, xxi. 9, Joshua vii. 25, and see, *e. g.*, the article on Burial in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*.] Isaiah lxvi. 24 contains, however, no reference to the ordinary disposition of the body, but is speaking of the horrible fate of the apostates, who, met by the judgment of God, lie dead *on the fields*, decaying or disposed of by burning. [Cf., *e. g.*, Duhm's *Isaiah*, *in loc.*]

Likewise the translation of Habbakuk iii. 4, "horns at his side" (II, p. 31) [p. 196, "horns coming out of his hand," A. V.], is over-strong; the parallelism with *nôgah*, "brightness," and the context ("and there was the *hiding* of his power"), shows rather that the word is to be translated by "rays." [So R. V., cf. margin. The translation "rays" is practically indubitable.] Accordingly there is an entire collapse of Delitzsch's opinion that Israel, as well as the Babylonians, had conceived of their God as horned.

*The assertion that the Song of Jonah is a mosaic of Psalm-passages (II, p. 16) [p. 171] is, in my opinion, as wrong as that considering Psalm xlv. as a mere "love-song" (II, p. 19) [p. 176]. At least Delitzsch should have expressed these views with some limitations.

The remark that "we" to-day are still seeking for Mount Sinai in the range of the Sinai peninsula (II, p. 22) [p. 181] is not true with any such generality; in fact, many modern writers believe that it could not have been situated there. Here, likewise, Delitzsch proves himself not to have mastered the facts sufficiently. [The best known supporter of the (by no means impossible) theory referred to, is Prof. Sayce. He places Sinai in the land of Midian, at the head of the Gulf of Akabah. This theory is favored by, e. g., Prof. Gray in his very recent commentary on "Numbers" in the International Critical series.]

Delitzsch's polemic against the modern textual criticism of the Old Testament (II, p. 14) [p. 166] is without point. Of course, the rich Assyrian lexicon is of the utmost importance for the Hebraic, which often is deficient, and it is likewise possible to explain many passages, which have been given up by our science or which we could hope to reach only by textual emendations, by means of reference to the Babylonian. But by such means the assured consciousness of these generations of scholars is in no way annulled, namely, that many passages of the Old Testament are corrupt beyond recovery.

The etymological explanation of J" ("Yahwè"), as "the Existing, the Enduring one," is as dubious as that of "El" (God) as "Goal." Delitzsch should not have made such declarations without great reserve. For "Yahwè" he has done so (I, p. 47) [p. 69], but has neglected it for "El" (I, p. 45) [p. 71].

¹In many places it is evident that Delitzsch possesses no proper *historical* understanding of the Old Testament; which would be no reproach for an Assyriologist who sticks to his own subject.

This is seen most strongly when Delitzsch names the God, Who appears to Moses amid thunder and earthquake:

"The All-enfolding,
The All-upholding."

[Goethe's *Faust*, Part I, Scene XVI, Taylor's translation] (II, p. 21) [p. 179]. Delitzsch treats as the same the conception of God of Moses and that of — Faust!

A remarkable error against exegesis, as taught by the history of religion, is likewise the translation of Genesis xii. 8, by which Abram is supposed to have "*preached*" in the name of J" (II, p.

29) [p. 193]. *Preached?* Preached to whom? In all good sooth not to the Canaanites? The word in question means in that place, as all moderns will agree, not "to preach" but "to call on," as in ancient worship.

If Moses, in his anger, shivered the tables written by the hand of God, then, so Delitzsch thinks, he will have to bear "a reproach ascending in one unanimous shriek [*sic*] from all peoples of earth" (II, p. 21) [p. 179]. How much higher is the standpoint of the old folk-legend, which represents the anger of the hero of Israel at Israel's sin as so great that he threw the Divine tables to the ground in blinding wrath. What would Michael Angelo have said if he had known of this remark of Delitzsch's!

In Delitzsch's opinion, some words in the Book of Job border on blasphemy (II, p. 19) [p. 176], and so exclude the Old Testament from being a book of revelation. How much greater and freer were the creators of the Canon, when they included Job in the Holy Writ, in spite of the *apparent* blasphemies! For what sort of blasphemies are they? The mightiest outpouring of a holy man, who fears to lose his God, the Stay of his life, who fights for God and justice with tears of desperation in his eyes!

The fifth, sixth and seventh Commandments [the numeration used (see *infra*) is not clear] he supposes in II, p. 28 [p. 191] to owe their origin to the instinct of self-preservation. Really, now, *only* to that instinct? The national laws of Israel were "with a view to enhancing their sacred character and inviolability, referred to Yahwè himself, as the supreme Lawgiver" (II, p. 23) [p. 184]. Delitzsch here, quite in the manner of the older rationalism, understands an origin as of deliberate purpose, when it is really undeliberate, naïve, almost involuntary. The hoary codes, of this every ancient people is convinced, were not created by the living generation nor by their ancestors nor by men at all; they are far too wise and wonderful for such a source; they have been given by the Godhead Itself. This assertion has an entirely different origin when it is made not of laws which are a national inheritance, as was the case in Israel, but of a recently formed code. The latter is true of Hammurabi.

It is unhistorical, likewise, when Delitzsch thinks that the idea of original revelation is discredited by a single verse of the Old

Testament (II, pp. 3, 37) [pp. 151, 207. The reference is to Deuteronomy iv. 19]. But is the Old Testament a system in which there can be no contradiction, or does it not rather contain a varied plenitude of records of a great process in the history of religion, in which there actually have been all sorts of different positions? In this case if a single verse is to exclude an original revelation, why should not another contain this idea?

Delitzsch charges the collection of pamphlets embodied in the book of Daniel with "mistakes and omissions" (II, p. 16) [p. 170]; but the legends of the book are *popular traditions*, which we have no right to measure by the standard of strict history. [For a summary of the reasons for assigning Daniel to the time of the Maccabees the reader may be referred to Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* or to any similar work. This date is generally conceded.]

As an example of the *frivolity* with which men have handled the Ten Commandments, Delitzsch instances again the division of the Commandments that is customary in the Lutheran Church [and the Roman Catholic. Commandments I and II are united while X is divided] (II. p. 20) [p. 178]. As regards the *fact*, Delitzsch is unquestionably right; but who will instance such a trifle to prove that mankind has not deserved a further Divine revelation! Why not allow a modern church to arrange the ancient material in her own way for practical purposes?

That different races may have a different understanding of the sacred history—which is obvious to the historic comprehension—is something Delitzsch cannot bring himself to see; in early exposition such as Hebrews i. 8 ff. he sees only aberrations (II, p. 19) [p. 177]. He even finds fault that the expression "the worm that dieth not" stands in Jesus' description of Hell fire, where it is "not quite in place" (I, p. 69) [p. 120]; thus Delitzsch parades our or his *modern* conception as obvious, and demands even of the age of the New Testament that it follow this explanation! *Moreover, does not Delitzsch use a critical edition of the New Testament?* Had he looked into a modern critical edition, he would have noticed that St. Mark ix. 44, 46, which he quotes with v. 48, are at present regarded as spurious, and that since only the last clause of v. 43 (with possibly

that of v. 45) but not that of v. 47 ff. speak of Hell fire, his whole observation fails. [For this question cf. A. V. with R. V. in loc. The justice of the point made is unquestionable, as the shorter reading of R. V. has overwhelming authority.] But what would Delitzsch say of a theologian who would deal so uncritically with Assyriological matters? *And why does Delitzsch talk of the New Testament in which he is evidently not at home?*

Very unhistorical is the manner, too, in which he explains the meaning of El, "God," which according to him is to mean "Goal." The Godhead is the Goal, that is, It is the Being to whom as to a goal the eyes of men looking heavenwards are turned, after whom the human heart yearns away from the mutability and imperfection of earthly life (I, p. 45 f.) [p. 69 f.]. What a crass modernization! As if it were *obvious* to "*man*" that he seeks the Godhead in heaven, and that he yearns away after it from the mutability of this world!

It is unhistorical also when Delitzsch asserts that Genesis i. does not contain the idea that God is the Almighty Creator of heaven and earth, because it leaves the question unanswered: "Whence did chaos originate?" (I, p. 65) [p. 109]. But the idea of "creation" has its *history*; therefore we can properly say that this idea in Genesis i. for the chaos itself was not *thought out* up to the ultimate conclusion; but we cannot doubt that the priestly author of this section would have wished to express this idea. But we dare not seek such finer distinctions in Delitzsch.

According to Deuteronomy iv. 19—which, incidentally, is well known to the Old Testament scholars as a matter of course, although Delitzsch calls it "forgotten" (II, p. 3) [p. 151]—God has divided the host of heaven—i. e., the stars—to the people. Delitzsch misunderstood the passage completely if he thinks that God Himself has abandoned all the heathens to godlessness (II, p. 36 f.) [p. 207 f.]; the meaning is rather that the stars are really divine beings, even if subordinate to J". ["A means by which God preserves the heathen from complete extinction of the consciousness of God." —Steuernagel.] Furthermore, it shows a total lack of method when Delitzsch combines this verse with Deuteronomy vii. 2, according to which J" commands Israel to exterminate the nations of Canaan,

and when he calls it a "terrible [*furchtbar*]" thought, that J'' should so mercilessly punish the nations, whom He Himself has abandoned to godlessness—and *because* He has so abandoned them. In this manner Delitzsch combines passages which have no inner connection; he handles Deuteronomy as though it were admittedly the work of a single author; this is a method that we should not tolerate in scientists among us. But that both passages have no inner connection is clear—Deuteronomy vii. 2 in no sense presupposes that the idol-worship of the Canaanites is from J''. Moreover, the point here is not that J'' wishes to destroy the people of Canaan "*on account of their godlessness*," but rather lest they seduce Israel to idolatry. [Note.—The criticism of Deuteronomy is probably the most difficult problem in the study of the Hexateuch and the agreement of scholars is anything but unanimous on the subject. A majority hold that the original work consists of chapters v.—xxvi., xxviii. and that the other chapters are somewhat later, but, when so eminent a scholar as Prof. Driver defends the first four chapters as an original part of the work, this view cannot be regarded as assured. Prof. Gunkel, however, takes it for granted and the justice of his argument here may be left to the reader.]

The most ingenious analysis of Deuteronomy is that of Dr. Steuernagel, who, however, seems to have proved a little too much. According to his view, vii. 2 is a part of the original work, composed in the seventh century and published in 623 (the generally accepted date of the book, by Driver as well), while iv. 19 was added probably during the Captivity. All that can be said with any certainty, however, is that *if* there is a distinction, then iv. 19 is later than vii. 2, but not much later.]

Other examples follow [in Delitzsch, *i. c.*]

* Hammurabi §§ 196 ff.; Exodus xxi. 24 f.

⁹ §§ 170 f.; Psalm ii. 7. ¹⁰ §§ 192, 282; Hosea i, ii.

¹¹ §§ 244, 246; Genesis xxxi. 39. ¹² § 9.

¹³ § 144; Genesis xvi. ¹⁴ Genesis xvi. ¹⁵ § 146.

¹⁶ A more complete discussion of the Babylonian-Israelite relations in the legend will be found in the *Christliche Welt*, 1903, No. 6, cols. 121-134. [Written by Prof. Gunkel and referred to by Del-

itzsch on p. 88. The reader should notice that the "D." printed before the name there is not an "initial," but the abbreviation for "Doctor of Theology," as distinguished from "Dr." (of Philosophy).]

¹⁷ I, p. 32 [p. 46].

¹⁸ I, p. 31 [p. 45]; other instances in the following.

¹⁹ Still, as H[einrich] Zimmern [professor of Assyriology and Semitics at Leipsic] suggests to me, a connection between the Babylonian abûbu and the Hebraic mabbûl is conceivable. [The word for ark (tebha) is possibly of Egyptian origin.]

²⁰ I, p. 29 [p. 42, but here the translation (made from the *second* edition) reads simply "original form"]; in the second edition Delitzsch has altered this expression, but again without adding a single word on the peculiar value of the Israelite tradition.

²¹ II, p. 33 [p. 200].

²² The principal passages are Psalms civ. 5 ff., xlvi. 3 f.; Isaiah xvii. 12-14, li. 9 f.; Psalms lxxxix. 10 ff.; Job xxvi. 12, ix. 13; Psalms lxxiv. 12 ff.; Isaiah xxvii. 1; Daniel vii.; Revelations xii, xiii., xvii. A more complete discussion of these passages in my work "Schöpfung und Chaos," pp. 29-114.

²³ Delitzsch's remark on the distinction of sources in the *Paradise story* (I, p. 67) [p. 114] is surprising; there may be traced in the Biblical narrative in Gen., chap. ii. *seq.*, another and older form which recognized but one tree in the middle of the garden—the *Tree of Life*. But this supposition that an older recension of the story knew of only a single tree has been expressed already and long ago (by Budde [professor at Strassburg and a conservative scholar of the highest reputation]), and is known almost universally. But critics assume, usually, that this single tree was the tree of *Knowledge*. [The theory referred to is this: The story of Paradise and the Fall belongs entirely to J. But J itself is not a simple narrative but contains here a narrative J^e which has been combined by a redactor with small selections from an earlier and cruder source Jⁱ. In their separate forms, Jⁱ spoke of both trees, while J^e knew but one, that of Knowledge. Accordingly the narrative to

which Delitzsch refers is the "one-tree-narrative" of J^e,—the fact that J^j is older than J^e is not the point, merely that J^e is older than the *combined* narrative. It may be added that while the theory in this form has been developed entirely by Prof. Gunkel (Prof. Budde's analysis (1883) was somewhat different), yet the grounds on which it rests are acknowledged by practically all critics. For details, see Gunkel's *Genesis*. Prof. Delitzsch's ignorance of the whole theory appears to be absolute.] Do Delitzsch's words here rest only on an interchange? Or does he really think that he has succeeded in saying something? In the latter case he should have expounded and sustained his opinion more fully; the arguments that he uses have been employed for other purposes up to the present.

²⁴ II, p. 15 [p. 168].

²⁵ Delitzsch (I, p. 28) [p. 40], who does not seem to occupy himself with investigations in the history of religion, finds it "significant" that Israelite tradition itself no longer affords any certain information respecting the origin of the Sabbath; the student of that science finds it simply *self-evident*.

²⁶ Cf. Zimmern, *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*³, pp. 592 ff.

²⁷ I, p. 29 [p. 41].

²⁸ The material, which Delitzsch arrays in the comparison of the two religions, is of very different natures; partly it contains portions in which Israel is dependent on Babylon; partly, cases where a certain similarity is observed without dependence being necessary on that account; often the similarities are so general that they are found everywhere in antiquity, as, *e. g.*, that the Godhead reveals Itself in a dream or through an intermediary. Such latter cases would not have been mentioned at all in this connection by an investigator trained in the history of religion.

²⁹ Cf. Chamberlain, *Dilettantismus*, p. 44 ff.; Ed. Meyer in Roscher's *Lexikon der römischen und griechischen Mythologie*, Art. El.

³⁰ I, p. 46 ff. [p. 71].

³¹ Zimmern, *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*³, p. 468. On the etymology of J'' and El. cf. above, note 6. Moreover, in itself there certainly can be nothing to protest against the occurrence

of the name J'' in pre-Israelite times; for Moses has certainly not invented the name [some interesting questions are raised here, particularly in studying the religion of the Midianites], we might rather assume even without evidence that the name had some sort of a previous history. Why should it not occur somewhere in the Babylonian pantheon as well? But the question is not as to the sound "Yahwè," but as to what sort of a divine figure men conceived under this name.

¹¹ Zimmern, *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*³, p. 609.

¹² Delitzsch (II, p. 30 ff.) [p. 195], in order to make the idolatry of the Babylonians conceivable, refers to the fact that even the prophets of Israel have represented J'' anthropomorphically. Quite right, the idea of the "immateriality" of God is striven for but not yet attained. But what a great advance it is nevertheless, that the prophetic religion repels every image with lofty scorn! And in that regard *we* are children of the prophets and not of the Babylonians. But how in this connection can Delitzsch actually point to the pictures of God the Father in Christian art? For every child among us knows what the Babylonians did *not* know, that such pictures are not really true pictures of the Godhead, but are mere works of the fancy.

¹⁴ II, p. 41 [p. 213].

¹⁵ II, p. 44 [p. 219].

¹⁶ I, p. 44 [p. 67].

¹⁷ II, p. 16 [p. 170].

¹⁸ II, p. 39 [p. 211].

¹⁹ II, p. 41 [p. 219].

²⁰ II, p. 44 [p. 219].

²¹ II, p. 20 [p. 178].

²² I, p. 59 [?]

²³ II, p. 20 [p. 178].

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

The American translation of the whole of *Babel und Bibel* has just been issued by The Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago, the first lecture having been published about a year ago. As far as the rendition is concerned there is little to choose between the work of Profs. McCormack and Carruth and that of Mr. Johns, but the English edition justifies its higher price by better execution and decidedly clearer plates, although the American edition contains a larger number of the latter. Pp. 120-144 of the American translation are devoted to a series of extracts from various replies to Prof. Delitzsch, and will be found helpful by the reader who is ignorant of German.

An instance of the irrelevance mentioned on p. 4 of the preface to the present pamphlet will be found in Dr. Carns' remarks on p. 143 of the translation. His sentence "Let no Athanasius with his limited knowledge bind the conscience of a Delitzsch," might serve as a sublime model for the insertion of an utterly pointless allusion. For what conceivable connection there can be between the Arian controversy and the present dispute is, to say the least, not obvious. It would be most interesting to learn how Prof. Delitzsch's investigations have rendered "the Nicene formulation of the Christian creed" "untenable." And what a consolation it is to learn that "divine science" promises to render our knowledge "unlimited!"
—E. S. B.

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

INTERLIBRARY LOANS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA BARBARA, CALIF. 93106

REC'D LD-URL
APR 07 1997
APR 29 1997

JAN 15 2002

